HYOCEPHALUS APRUGNUS BERGROTH, 1906 (INSECTA, HEMIPTERA-HETEROPTERA, HYOCEPHALIDAE): REQUEST FOR RETENTION OF THE NEOTYPE SPECIMEN IN PREFERENCE TO THE REDISCOVERED HOLOTYPE. Z.N.(S.) 1916

By J. A. Grant (*Birkbeck College, University of London*) and P. Štys (*Charles University, Prague*)

In 1906 the Finnish entomologist Ernst Evald Bergroth (1857–1925) described *Hyocephalus aprugnus* n. gen., n. sp. (locality—Yorketown, South Australia) and erected for it a new sub-family Hyocephalinae (in Coreidae, Heteroptera). It is clear from Bergroth's two papers on the group (1906, 1912) that his first description was based on a single specimen, a macropterous female included in a small sample of Australian Hemiptera sent to him by Brancsik (Trenčín, Slovakia). In his second paper Bergroth briefly refers back to this as the 'type', but again does not disclose where it was deposited. Nevertheless the holotype status of any such single specimen is valid (International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, Article 73a), and the information given contains enough individualities to identify it absolutely (vide infra para. 3).

2. At the time of the first revision (Štys 1964) the holotype could not be traced though enquiries were made of the several institutions (in Helsinki, Budapest and Paris) most likely to have received it. Furthermore Štys established with reasonable certainty that none of the 16 other workers referring to Hyocephalidae in the intervening 58 years ever had access to it. Since *H. aprugnus* provided the only foundation for what had become the family Hyocephalidae (Reuter, 1912), and since suitable material was available Štys (1964, p. 232, fig. 1) designated a neotype. The neotype, deposited in the Természettudományi Múzeum Állattára (Budapest) is a topotypic female macropter from the Brancsik collection which Štys had found to contain a capture series of 11 further specimens not seen by Bergroth: thus the designation is in fullest accordance with the provisions of the Int. Code Zool. Nomencl., Article 75.

3. In 1969 Mr. G. F. Gross (South Australian Museum, Adelaide) forwarded to the second reviser (Grant—revision in MS.) a hyocephalid which he had found in a box of undetermined Australian Heteroptera from the collections of the Universitetets Zoologiska Museum, Helsinki. All specimens found in Bergroth's home at Ekenäs after his death were removed to this museum: many of his types have been recognized from the unidentified material since incorporated with the general collection (Dr. M. Meinander *in litt.*). After careful examination the present writers are agreed that, although it bears no specific identification as such, this specimen is beyond doubt the missing holotype of *H. aprugnus*. In common with Bergroth's description it is female and macropterous; the printed data label is identical with those of the established Brancsik series and shows the locality as 'Austral. Yorketown'; the figure '34', manuscript on a second label, corresponds with numerals handwritten by Bergroth in letters to Prof. O. M. Reuter (Meinander *in litt.*); the body length is 14.01 mm. as against 14.0 mm. recorded (*cf.* the seven measured

by Štys 1964, p. 232, ranged from 14.6–15.4 mm.); the antennae lack segments III and IV; most importantly its right hemelytral membrane shows the same venational cellulation and dichotomies as illustrated by Bergroth (1906, fig. 4)—in *H. aprugnus* this feature varies even unilaterally, and the topotypic series studied by Štys (1964) possessed nothing comparable.

4. Rediscovery of the holotype of *H. aprugnus* raises no problems of nomenclature: the holotype and the neotype designation are to all practical taxonomic purposes identical. However only one can stand as type to the species and under the Int. Code Zool. Nomencl., Article 75f, this case is referred to the Commission. By current standards Bergroth's description has many inadequacies which, in view of published work on the neotype, it is not scientifically gainful to republish from his specimen: damage to the antennae and hindwings of the holotype anyway precludes a remedy in these areas. The neotype has been the subject of the more detailed study (Štys 1964) and is at least unilaterally entire should any future need arise to consult new characters. In the view of both writers, as first and second revisers of the family Hyocephalidae, the neotype specimen should continue to serve as the basis for taxonomic reference.

5. The International Commission of Zoological Nomenclature is therefore requested:

(a) to use its plenary powers to invalidate the original holotype specimen of *Hyocephalus aprugnus* Bergroth, 1906, rediscovered in the collections of the Universitetets Zoologiska Museum (Helsinki) and, having done so, to uphold the validity of the female neotype kept in the collections of the Természettudományi Múzeum Állattára (Budapest).

(b) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the generic name *Hyocephalus* Bergroth, 1906 (gender : masculine), type species by monotypy, *Hyocephalus aprugnus* Bergroth, 1906.

(c) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the specific name *aprugnus* Bergroth, 1906, as published in the binomen *Hyocephalus aprugnus*.

(d) to place on the Official List of Family-group names in Zoology the family-group name HYOCEPHALIDAE Bergroth, 1906 (type genus: *Hyocephalus* Bergroth, 1906).

References

BERGROTH, E. E. 1906. Aphylinae und Hyocephalinae, zwei neue Hemipteren-Subfamilien. *Zool. Anz.*, **29**, pp. 644–649

BERGROTH, E. E. 1912. New or Little known Hemiptera, chiefly from Australia, in the American Museum of Natural History. *Bull. Amer. Mus. Nat. Hist.*, **31**, pp., 343–348

REUTER, O. M. 1912. Bemerkungen über mein neues Heteropterensystem. *Öfver. Fin. Veten.-Soc. Förh.* **54**, A(6), pp. 1–62

ŠTYS, P. 1964. The Morphology and Relationship of the Family Hyocephalidae (Heteroptera). *Acta. Zool. Acad. Sci. Hung.* **10** (1–2), pp. 229–262